

## REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the foregoing amendments and present remarks is respectfully requested. In addition, a petition for a two-month extension of time is submitted.

The Office Action noted that the following claims, if amended, would be allowable:

Claim 1, with the deletion of the term "carbon-carbon double bond-containing" (two occurrences) and the addition of the term "of poly(diallyldimethylammonium chloride)" before the period at the end of the claim.

Claim 3, in its present form if dependent from claim 1 as amended (described above).

Claim 4, with the deletion of the term "carbon-carbon double bond-containing" (two occurrences).

Claim 21, with the deletion of the added material "comprising the polymeric ...double bond-containing monomer" and the reinsertion of the term "a chemical moiety of claim 1".

Claim 2, which was indicated as being free of the prior art, was limited to the case in which both the "polyelectrolyte monomer" and the "biological agent recognition element-substituted polyelectrolyte monomer" are "poly(diallyldimethylammonium chloride)."

There is no descriptive support nor enabling support in the specification for the scope of the term "carbon-carbon double bond-containing" as used in the amended claims (new matter).

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 21 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no description in the specification of the term "carbon-carbon double bond-containing monomer".

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 21 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the reaction as set forth in Scheme

1 of page 9 of the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the reaction of any/all "monomers" which contain a "carbon-carbon double bond". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The "complete absence of carbon-carbon double bond bands" in the product resulting from the reaction performed in Example 5 of the specification (page 12, lines 11-12) indicates only that the reaction of the particular reactants of Scheme 1 provided a product which contains no double bonds. This section of the specification does not describe nor support the concept of using as reactants any/all monomers which contain "a carbon-carbon double bond". Note, that claim 21 does not require the use of a "poly(diallyldimethylammonium chloride)" reactant as required by claims 1, 3, and 4.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4 and 21 as suggested by the Patent Office. Such amendments are a proper response to the final rejection as they comply with the requirement of form such that the claims are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, claims 1, 3-4, and 21 are urged to be allowable over 35 U.S.C. 102, 103 and 112. If the Examiner believes there are any unresolved issues despite this amendment, the Examiner is urged to contact the applicants' attorney undersigned below for a telephonic interview to resolve any such issue. A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 25, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Attorney

Reg. No. 30,620  
Phone (505) 667-9168

Bruce H. Cottrell  
Los Alamos National Laboratory  
LC/IP, MS A187  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545